



2015

Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission
Plans Review Subcommittee

LEGAL ACTION REPORT

Thursday, February 12, 2015,
4th Floor Conference Room, Joel D. Valdez Main Library,
101 N. Stone, Tucson, Arizona 85701

1. Call to Order / Roll Call:

Meeting called to session at 1:05 PM

Commissioners: Arthur Stables (Acting Chair), Sharon Chadwick, Helen Erickson, Jim Sauer, Jean-Luc Cuisinier

Staff: Michael Taku, Alexandra Hines (PDSD), Jonathan Mabry, Jennifer Levstik (OIP), Elaine Becherer (CMO)

Motion by Commissioner Erickson to nominate Commissioner Stables as acting chair for the session. Motion seconded by Commissioner Cuisinier.

Motion passed. Vote 5-0.

2. Approval of Legal Action Report and Summary of Minutes of 1-22-15

Motion by Commissioner Stables to approve the Legal Action Report and Summary of Minutes of 1-22-15. Motion seconded by Commissioner Erickson.

Motion passed. Vote 5-0.

3. Courtesy Review

- a. Downtown Community Theaters and Historic Cultural Landscape –**
260 S. Church Avenue – Proposed renovation of the TCC Leo Rich Theater, Music Hall, Theater, and Eckbo Landscape (RND). **(UPDATE)**

Eliane Becherer, from the City Manager's Office, presented update to the project.

Commissioner Stables asked when the bond has to be approved by the Board of Supervisors. Staff Becherer responded that it will be in March.

Commissioner Erickson, who has full understanding of the scope of the project, will take lead and Commissioner Stables offered to assist as needed.

Commissioners were agreeable to support the project by writing a letter with hope for understanding the historic importance of the project and increase project funding.

Staff Taku stated that the commissioners can state their intent to support in a letter but a motion was not needed for a courtesy review case.

4. Historic Preservation Zone Review Cases

a. HPZ-15-03 – 836 N. 6th Avenue – Clark / Roth – Proposed stucco over brick; new wrought iron fence. (West University) (CONTINUED)

Staff Taku gave background to the proposal noting that the large stucco job required full review. Staff Taku read the West University Historic Advisory Board minutes into the record highlighting that the motion denied the stucco treatment.

Mr. Roth provided background to the proposal and noted that many houses in the area have stucco.

Commissioner Cuisinier stated that the bricks need fixing no matter what before stucco treatment. Commissioner Stables added lathing the whole wall for integrity to prevent cracking. Commissioner Cuisinier noted that stucco would be okay if proven that the house was stuccoed in the past.

Commissioner Stables questioned the applicants if they have spoken to a brick mason or contractor. Mr. Roth agreed that Mr. Telles, a brick contractor, has been out to the site and suggested a lime wash finish. Mr. Roth looked into different options since WUZHAB does not like the stucco. Commissioner Chadwick clarified that a proposal should not come from quote, 'matching your neighbors'.

Mr. Roth said that the brick repairs done in the past does not look nice. Commissioner Cuisinier explained that the joints need to be cleaned and re-pointed. This would be the most appropriate way. Staff Mabry explained that the brick can be matched by contacting demolition companies that salvage and sell a bricks.

Mr. Roth inquired if the homeowners asked the wrong questions of Mr. Telles. Commissioner Stables said Mr. Telles is very good. The subcommittee likes to be in line with WUZHAB and to retain original character.

Mr. Roth pointed out that a wall has moved, but Commissioner Chadwick noted that stucco will not help areas that have moved.

Motion by Commissioner Sauer to recommend approval of wrought iron fence proposal as presented and to deny stucco over brick on exterior of building. Further recommend cleaning all joints, repointing, and replacing broken brick with matching historic bricks. Seconded by Commissioner Cuisinier.

Staff Mabry extended his contact information to the applicants, noting that proper treatment can be done.

Motion passed. Vote 5-0.

5. Current Issues for Information/Discussion:

a. Minor Reviews

Summary of onsite reviews conducted on January 23, 2015.

HPZ-15-04 – 215 East 18th Street – Prival Residence - Install Solar Panels. (Amory Park)

HPZ-15-05 – 624 East 2nd Street – Millstone Residence – Install New Security Doors. (West University)

HPZ-15-06 – 98 East Congress Street – Wig-O-Rama - Install New Sign. (RND)

HPZ-15-07 – 442 North 6th Avenue – 6th & 6th Holding Co.LLC - Install New Sign. (RND)

b. Appeals

Nothing at this time.

c. Zoning Violations

Staff reported on working with Code Enforcement Division on some pending violations that will soon be presented to the Plans Review Subcommittee.

d. Historic Preservation Zone Design Guidelines

West University Design Guidelines to be scheduled on 2/26/15 for final review.

e. National Historic Preservation Act - Section 106 Compliance Process – Informational Review

Staff Mabry gave informational presentation with handouts of National Historic Preservation Act and the Section 106 Compliance Process.

Commissioner Erickson asked why there is a difference between the SHPO letter and Tucson webpage for the Area of Potential Effect for the HUD-funded Downtown Motor Apts. project as the site and the surrounding historic districts, and the historic property identified as being adversely affected. Staff Mabry explained that SHPO concurred with the City's position stating there is no adverse effect on the Historic Districts because qualities that made them eligible for historic designation are not being affected. Commissioner Stables said that the style of the Downtown Motor Lodge has no connection to the two surrounding Historic Districts as it is not one of the types of architecture associated with the identified significances of the districts.

Commissioner Sauer asked who signs and agrees with the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for resolving Adverse Effects of the Downtown Motor Apts. project. Staff Mabry said the city, SHPO, and developer are signatory parties, and some of the consulting parties may be invited to be concurring parties.

6. Call to the Audience

No one to speak.

7. Future Items

Nothing at this time.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.